

**Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Because claim 2 was improperly rejected based on a reference that is not effective as prior art against this application, applicant submits that the previous final rejection was improper and should be withdrawn. In any event, even if the previous action and its finality are maintained, the amendments to claim 1 and 5 merely incorporate the features that were previously added to claim 2, and therefore do not raise any new issues requiring further search or consideration.

**Claim Status**

Claims 1-7 are pending. Claims 1, 5 and 7 are amended.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103(a) – Claims 2, 7**

Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Yoon (US 6,697,083) in view of Meins (US 6,587,700) and Awan et al. (US 6,792,293). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because Awan et al. is not prior art against the present application.

Awan et al. has a United States filing date of September 13, 2000. The present application, however, claims priority in JP 2000-019183, filed January 27, 2000; JP 2000-019184, filed January 27, 2000; and JP 2000-020702, filed January 28, 2000. Translations of certified copies of these priority documents, together with statements that the translations are accurate, were already submitted in this application with an amendment dated December 18, 2003. Thus, Awan is not available as prior art against this application. The Examiner is referred to applicant's amendment dated June 25, 2004, which contains a complete discussion of the law on this issue.

There being no further grounds for rejection, the rejections of claims 2 and 7 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn. Claim 7 is also amended to correct minor typographical errors.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103(a) – Claims 1 and 3-6**

Appl. No. 09/768,712  
Amdt. dated September 6, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81922.0005  
Customer No. 26021

Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected as obvious over Yoon in view of Meins. In response, independent claims 1 and 5 are amended in an analogous fashion to claim 2. Claims 1 and 5 now require that the first display is illuminated only when the second case is in the open position, and that the second display is illuminated only when the second case is in the closed position.

Awan was cited against claim 2 as disclosing this feature. However, as discussed above, Awan is not effective prior art against this application. Thus, claims 1 and 5, and claims 3 and 6 dependent thereon, are allowable for the same reasons as claim 2. The rejections under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

### ***Conclusion***

This application is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response, including the fee for requesting continued examination, may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

By: 

Troy M. Schmelzer  
Registration No.36,667  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: September 6, 2005

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701